

REMARKS

Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 4, 9 through 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,128,655 (Fields). Examiner has rejected claims 5 through 8, 15 through 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields.

Applicant has amended the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as to the claims as amended.

Below, Applicant points out subject matter within each independent claim that is not disclosed or suggested by Fields. On the basis of this, Applicant believes all the claims are patentable over Fields.

Brief Description of Fields

Fields discloses a distribution mechanism for filtering, formatting and reuse of web based content. Upon a request 111 from a client 113 for a given web page, the hosting site 103 makes a request 117 for the web page. See Figure 2 and column 4, lines 33 through 38. The page is returned 119 to the hosting site 103. See Figure 2 and column 4, lines 39 through 42. After hosting site 103 receives the web page, the pass through publisher 101 retrieves the filter definitions and policies from the filter database 109 for the content provider web site. The pass through publisher 101 uses the retrieved web page and the filter definitions and policies to recast a new web page to send to the client 113. See column 4, lines 50 through 64.

Discussion of Independent Claim 1

Step (a) of claim 1:

Claim 1 sets out a system comprising a method for obtaining content for publication. In step (a), publishable content is stored within at least one content server. Each item of the publishable content includes specific criteria pertaining to publication of the item. This is not disclosed or suggested by Fields.

Examiner has suggested that the specific criteria pertaining to publication of the item is disclosed by filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 and described at column 4, lines 25 through 27 of Fields. This is impossible, as Fields indicates that the filter database 109 is used in an entirely different way and for a different purpose than the specific criteria set out in claim 1.

For example, the specific criteria, set out in step (a) of claim 1, is used by each content server to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system (see step (d) of claim 1). However, filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 of Fields is not even accessed by the hosting site 103, until after the hosting site has already obtained a requested web page. In Fields, the filter database 109 is not used to obtain a document, but rather, after a document has been obtained, the filter database 109 provides information about definitions and policies of a particular content provider web site. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 52. The pass through publisher 101 uses

the information about definitions and policies to recast a new web page to send to the client 113. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 64.

Since Fields teaches that the filter database 109 is not used until after a document has been obtained from a content provider web site, it is clear that filter database 109 does not disclose or suggest specific criteria utilized by a content server to determine which publishable content to send to a service location system, as set out in step (a) of claim 1.

Step (d) of claim 1:

In step (d) of claim 1, the service location system uses the requested criteria for the requested publishing content to obtain from the at least one content server, first publishing content that satisfies the requested criteria. Each of the at least one content server utilizes the specific criteria pertaining to publication of each item to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system. This is not disclosed or suggested by Fields.

As discussed above, Examiner has suggested that the specific criteria pertaining to publication of the item is disclosed by filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 and described at column 4, lines 25 through 27 of Fields. This is impossible, as Fields indicates that the filter database 109 is used in an entirely different way and for a different purpose than the specific criteria set out in claim 1.

The specific criteria set out in claim 1 is used by each content server to

determine which publishable content to send to the service location system. However, filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 of Fields is not even accessed by the hosting site 103 until after the hosting site 103 has already obtained a requested web page. In Fields, the filter database 109 is not used to obtain a document, but rather, after a document has been obtained, the filter database 109 provides information about definitions and policies of a particular content provider web site. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 52. The pass through publisher 101 uses the information about definitions and policies to recast a new web page to send to the client 113. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 64.

Since Fields teaches that the filter database 109 is not used until after a document has been obtained from a content provider web site, it is clear that filter database 109 does not disclose or suggest a content server utilizing specific criteria pertaining to publication of each item to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system, as set out in step (d) of claim 1.

Discussion of Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 sets out a method for obtaining content for publication. In step (c) of claim 10, the service location system uses requested criteria for the requested publishing content to obtain from at least one content server, first publishing content that satisfies the requested criteria. Each of the at least

one content server utilizes specific criteria included in publishable content to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system. This is not disclosed or suggested by Fields.

As discussed above, Examiner has suggested that the specific criteria pertaining to publication of the item is disclosed by filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 and described at column 4, lines 25 through 27 of Fields. This is impossible, as Fields indicates that the filter database 109 is used in an entirely different way and for a different purpose than the specific criteria set out in claim 10.

The specific criteria set out in step (c) of claim 10 is used by each content server to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system. However, filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 of Fields is not even accessed by the hosting site 103 until after the hosting site 103 has already obtained a requested web page. In Fields, the filter database 109 is not used to obtain a document, but rather, after a document has been obtained, the filter database 109 provides information about definitions and policies of a particular content provider web site. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 52. The pass through publisher 101 uses the information about definitions and policies to recast a new web page to send to the client 113. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 64.

Since Fields teaches that the filter database 109 is not used until after a document has been obtained from a content provider web site, it is clear that

filter database 109 does not disclose or suggest a content server utilizing specific criteria pertaining to publication of each item to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system, as set out in step (c) of claim 10.

Discussion of Independent Claim 11

Claim 1 sets out a system for obtaining content for publication. The system comprises a publishing system and a service location system. The service location system uses requested criteria for requested publishing content to obtain from at least one content server first publishing content that satisfies the requested criteria. Each of the at least one content server utilizes specific criteria included in publishable content to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system. This is not disclosed or suggested by Fields.

As discussed above, Examiner has suggested that the specific criteria pertaining to publication of the item is disclosed by filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 and described at column 4, lines 25 through 27 of Fields. This is impossible, as Fields indicates that the filter database 109 is used in an entirely different way and for a different purpose than the specific criteria set out in claim 11.

The specific criteria set out in claim 11 is used by each content server to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system.

However, filter database 109 shown in Figure 2 of Fields is not even accessed by the hosting site 103 until after the hosting site 103 has already obtained a requested web page. In Fields, the filter database 109 is not used to obtain a document, but rather, after a document has been obtained, the filter database 109 provides information about definitions and policies of a particular content provider web site. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 52. The pass through publisher 101 uses the information about definitions and policies to recast a new web page to send to the client 113. See Fields at column 4, lines 50 through 64.

Since Fields teaches that the filter database 109 is not used until after a document has been obtained from a content provider web site, it is clear that filter database 109 does not disclose or suggest a content server utilizing specific criteria pertaining to publication of each item to determine which publishable content to send to the service location system, as set out in claim 11.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this Amendment has placed the present case in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
KEVIN G. CURRANS
JOHN A. BERTANI

By 
Douglas L. Weller
Reg. No. 30,506

February 9, 2005
Santa Clara, California
(408) 985-0642